

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended herein to correct minor informalities. A listing of the claims can be found at pages 2-4 of this Reply. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta (US 6,990,492). Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 and 7-20 is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Gupta does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element as recited in the subject claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Applicant’s invention as claimed relates to regulating access of an application to a computer platform by way of applying and analyzing trust levels associated with the application and modules called by the application. To that end, claim 1 recites ***a component that compares an applied trust level of an application with a trust level of a module called by the application and regulates access of the application to a distributed computing platform based at least in part upon the comparison.*** Claim 10 recites ***means for regulating access of an application... requesting access to a distributed computing platform... to the distributed computing platform by analyzing a trust level of a module called by the application,*** and claim 12 recites ***determining a trust level for a first module called by an application, the application requesting access to the distributed computing platform, and regulating access of the application to the distributed computing platform based at least in part upon the determined level of trust for the first module.*** Gupta does not disclose or suggest such claimed aspects.

Gupta relates to controlling access to data objects. For example, the cited reference includes an example where a doctor has particular access rights with respect to certain portions of a patient's file while not having access rights with respect to other portions of the patient's file. To enable such selective restriction of access to all or portions of a data object, relationships between users and data objects are defined (e.g., between a doctor and a patient's data folder) and access rights are associated with each relationship. For instance, it would be desirable to provide a doctor with at least partial access to a patient's data folder. When a user requests access to a data object, a security classification for each found relationship is determined, wherein such security classifications can be dependent upon role of the user (e.g., primary care provider). Thereafter, security classification(s) assigned to the data object are ascertained, and the security classifications of the relationship are compared with the security classification(s) of the desirably accessed data object. A determination can then be made regarding whether the user has access (and types of access rights) based at least in part upon the comparison (See col. 9, line 65 – col. 11, line 2). These access rights can be based upon a user's role, such as a type of doctor (e.g., primary care provider).

As can be ascertained from a cursory review of Gupta, the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest *regulating access of an application to a distributed computing platform* as is recited in the subject claims. Gupta discloses regulating a user's access to a data object; nowhere in Gupta is there a mention of a distributed computing platform, much less *an application that requests access to a distributed computing platform*. Distributed computing enables a process to run a single computational task on more than one distinct computer – thus, a distributed computing platform is a system that facilitates distributed computing. Gupta is not even tangentially related to distributed computing, and thus does not disclose *regulation of access to a distributed computing platform* as claimed.

Moreover, Gupta clearly fails to disclose *a first module called by an application*, much less *determining a trust level for the first module*. Rather, Gupta teaches that a user requests access to a data object, wherein the user can have predefined relationships with the object that are associated with certain access rights (e.g., due to a role of the user). It is readily apparent, however, that the user is not an application, and that the user does not call a module. Moreover, even if the user is deemed to be an application, such user is not requesting access to a distributed computing platform, but rather is requesting access to a data object.

In view of the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Gupta does not disclose, teach, or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1, 10, and 12 (and claims 2-5, 7-9, 11, and 13-20 which respectfully depend therefrom). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP150US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Michael J. Medley/_____

Michael J. Medley

Reg. No. 57,058

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731